

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached drawing sheets incorporate Figures 1-3 that were incorporated into the original specification by reference.

Attachment: Drawing Sheets 1-3

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Figures 1-3 are added and the specification is amended to reference Figures 1-3, where appropriate. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**I. Objection to Drawings**

The Office Action raises an objection under 37 CFR §1.83(a).

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Duong in the October 28, 2005 telephone conference. As discussed during the telephone conference, attached are three sheets of figures from U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/257,396, filed December 22, 2000 and which was incorporated by reference in its entirety into the original specification at paragraph [0001]. Formal copies of the figures will be submitted upon request.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

**II. Changes to the Specification**

Paragraph [0007] has been amended to correct an obvious typographical error.

Further, the specification has been amended to refer to Figures 1-3 and to identify references to Figures 1-3 in the specification. Specifically, paragraphs [0019a], [0019b], and [0019c] are inserted and paragraphs 46-47, and 49 are amended to be identical to corresponding paragraphs within U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/257,396 (Provisional '396), filed December 22, 2000 and which was incorporated by reference in its entirety into the original specification. Paragraphs within Provisional '396 identical to amended paragraphs 46-47 and 49 may be found at page 8, line 16; page 9, line 5; and page 9, line 17.

The changes to the specification are for clarity and convenience purposes only and do not constitute new matter because the amended paragraphs were already incorporated by reference into the original specification.

### **III. §102(e) Rejection**

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 5,483,467 to Krupka et al. ("Krupka"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "whereby when one of said data ports is placed in communication with one of said local system ports, said visual indicator corresponding to said data port may display information about said corresponding data port." Krupka does not disclose, teach or suggest such a feature.

The Office Action asserts that Krupka teaches such a feature at col. 1, lines 56-58. Applicant respectfully asserts that although the passage may describe a "visual indicator" associated with known scanning systems, nowhere does the passage disclose, teach or suggest that "when one of said data ports is placed in communication with one of said local system ports, said visual indicator corresponding to said data port may display information about said corresponding data port," as recited in the claims.

The Krupka reference cited by the Office Action is specifically addressed by the original specification at paragraph [0007], which states:

U.S. Pat. No. 5,483,467 to Krupk[a] et al. discloses a particular example of such an application in which a computer or microprocessor employs a scanner to continuously sense the interconnection arrangement or configuration of the LAN cabling. . . . . Krupk[a] discloses the logic circuitry of the computer or microprocessor receiving intermittent scanning inputs through a detection matrix to insure that the actual cabling configuration is in conformity with what is designed. The Krupk[a] scanner may provide an interconnection status output to the computer or to a dedicated output device. One type of dedicated output device for displaying the interconnection status of a LAN is an array of lights

disposed in corresponding relationship to particular ports within the LAN.

Krupka represents an example of a conventional system that uses scanning to determine the connectivity between data ports in a network. As described at paragraphs [0009] through [0012], such systems may be capable of supporting Move/Add/Change operations, but such systems suffer from numerous inefficiencies. As stated in the original specification at paragraph [0063]:

Although there are many ways in which an automated documentation and revision system could determine which ports are electrically connected to which other ports, one currently considered as preferable employs a distinct electrical contact associated with each port in the LAN and an electrical conductor within each LAN cord for electrically connecting the two contacts associated with the respective ports connected by the cord. The present system, like prior known systems, detects this electrical connection in arriving at the global LAN configuration, but only the inventive system utilizes the cord conductor connected to the information module port or system port in conjunction with the revision process, as well as with the global scanning and analysis process (emphasis added).

In other words, Krupka does not disclose a local system port, much less a cord conductor that may be used to selectively place one of said local system ports in communication with one of said data ports "whereby when one of said data ports is placed in communication with one of said local system ports, said visual indicator corresponding to said data port may display information about said corresponding data port," as recited in the claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Krupka. Claims 5, 13, 21 and 23-25 include features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1, and are likewise patentably distinguishable over Krupka for at least the reasons stated above. The remaining claims depend from one of claims 5, 13 and 21 and

are likewise patentably distinguishable over Krupka for at least their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### IV. §103 Rejections

The Office Action rejects claims 5-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Krupka in view of U.S. Patent 5,583,874 to Smith et al. ("Smith"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, independent claims 5, 13, 21 and 23-25 recite, *inter alia*, "whereby when one of said data ports is placed in communication with one of said local system ports, said visual indicator corresponding to said data port may display information about said corresponding data port." As discussed above, Krupka does not teach or suggest such features. Smith also does not disclose, teach or suggest such a feature. Therefore, any combination of Krupka and Smith cannot make up for the identified deficiencies and would not have rendered obvious the invention recited in claims 5, 13, 21 and 23-25.

The Office Action asserts, at page 6, lines 14-17, that Smith teaches "when said portable information module is connected to one of said local system ports, said portable information module may be placed into communication with and display information about respective ones of said data ports in said system" at col. 1, line 53 - col. 2, line 37. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Smith describes "[a] portable tester for local area networks comprising a AUI circuit coupled to a media specific transceiver, a battery, a push-to-test switch and four light emitting diodes and an RJ45 jack for each of a personal computer and a network hub." (Abstract) However, as further stated in the Abstract, "**[t]he PC and network hub cannot both be simultaneously connected.**" Because the apparatus described in Smith is specifically limited to connecting to a single port, the device in Smith is not connected to a

local system port and then "placed in communication with and display information about respective ones of said data ports in said system."

Accordingly, claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over the Krupka/Smith combination. Claims 13, 21 and 23-25 include features similar to those described above with respect to claim 5, and are likewise patentably distinguishable over the Krupka/Smith combination for at least the reasons stated above. The remaining claims depend from one of claims 5, 13 and 21 and are likewise patentably distinguishable over Krupka for at least their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.


**V. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-25 are earnestly solicited.

This Reply is being submitted within the two-month extension period for reply to the Office Action. The Commissioner is authorized to charge the two-month extension fee, as well as any additional fee other than the issue fee, to deposit account number 16-0228.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Zachary J. Smolinski  
Registration No. 47,100

Date: November 29, 2005